

REMARKS

Claims 8-9 and 14-15 have been cancelled. Thus, Claims 1-7, 10-13 and 16-19 are currently pending in the present application, all of which have been amended.

In response to the restriction requirement set forth by the Examiner, Applicants elect Group I (Claims 1-7, 10-13 and 16-19) for further prosecution and withdraw Group II (Claims 8-9 and 14-15) without prejudice.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for not particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

The phrase "capable of" had been deleted from Claim 1. Thus, the § 112 rejection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6, 10-13 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Breen et al.* (US 6,928,568) in view of *Saeki et al.* (US 6,657,415). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

Amended Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 10 and 16) now recites "a circuit operatively connected to said battery and said AC power supply, wherein said circuit turns off a charging function to said battery while said battery is still connected to said AC power supply during said computer system being powered off."

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the claimed circuit is not disclosed by *Breen*; however, the Examiner asserts that the claimed disclosed circuit is disclosed by *Saeki* in col. 6, lines 19-22. Although *Saeki* discloses the ability of a charging circuit 12 to

turn off a charging function to a battery while the battery is connected to an AC power supply, *Saeki* does not teach or suggest "said circuit turns off a charging function to said battery while said battery is still connected to said AC power supply during said computer system being powered off" (emphasis added).

Because the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention, thus the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-6 and 12-17 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1 and 12, and their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner, but not relied upon, has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any addition fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against Lenovo Deposit Account No. **50-3533**.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS